DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 238 SP 007 470

TITLE	PPPBTE. Pilot Projects on Performance-Based Teacher Education. Number 3, March 1973.
INSTITUTION	New Haven Education Improvement Center, Conn.
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	4p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Information Storage; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Performance Criteria
IDENTIFIERS	*Connecticut; MAP; Multiple Alternatives Program

ABSTRACT

This document is divided into four sections, each an announcement of an event related to teacher education. The first section is a discussion of in-service education with a brief description of the book "Improving In-Service Education (1971)," edited by Louis Rubin. Section two is a description of the University of Bridgeport's Multiple Alternatives Program (MAP), a competency-based teacher education model for in-service elementary teachers. The procedure of MAP is described: each professional growth plan is designed and planned by the participant and a staff member, with the participant's performance evaluated on the degree to which specific performance goals, based on identified needs, have been achieved. Section three is an announcement of the performance-based teacher education (PBTE) conference to be held in Boston, April 16-17, 1973. The final section is an announcement of the existence of the Clearinghouse for the Connecticut Pilot Projects on PBTE. (JA)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084238

PPPBTE

PILOT PROJECTS ON PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Number 3 March, 1973

IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION: AN ENFORCED MARCH OR AN ENLIGHTENED JOURNEY?

In Connecticut, as in many other states, present approaches to in-service teacher education are being questioned and alternatives explored. During the early--and crucial--years of their professional life, most Connecticut teachers enroll in a Master's degree program. The State requires either a Master's or a 30-credit planned program beyond the Bachelor's degree, as well as three years of successful teaching, for the Standard Certificate. Most teachers elect the Master's program because many school systems favor it over the 30-credit program in their salary schedule. It is difficult to assess the degree to which improved performance is directly related to these courses. Also, the decision to enter a Master's program often means a "Planned Program," designed by the college with little or no input from the individual or school system. The Planned Program does not necessarily allow for the current performance of the teacher; the teacher's working environment; the teacher's interests and professional goals; the supervisor's recommendations; nor for the needs of the school system for professional growth patterns to facilitate the introduction or improvement of specific system-wide goals, such as reading, drug abuse, or the language development of five-year-olds.

Whereas decisions about pre-service and in-service programs are usually made by the colleges, school systems are held accountable for the performance of all school personnel --a situation often resulting in a duplication of time, effort and funds, commodities in short supply. Further, school system people not only question the procedure, but are demanding that since they are held accountable, they should share in the decision-making about all components of professional growth.

The major issues relating to in-service teacher education are discussed with insight and clarity in a recent book, Improving In-Service Education (1971), edited by Louis Rubin, with chapters by Ralph Tyler, Robert Bush, Dwight Allen, and others. This book is a "gold mine" for those seeking to improve teacher education, who support the concept of teacher and school system involvement in the planning process, and who believe the competence and zeal of the teacher are the most important factors in quality education.

The book's theme is exemplified by Tyler: "In-Service Education of the future will not be seen as 'shaping' teachers but rather . . . as aiding, supporting, and encouraging each teacher's developing of teaching capabilities that he values and seeks to enhance. The guiding . . . spirit will be one in which learning itself is of primary importance" (p. 15).

Robert Bush of Stanford University outlines a new overall design for teacher education that spans a six-year period and bridges the traditional gap between pre- and in-service programs, with college faculty, teaching, supervisory, and administrative personnel of the school system work closely to provide in-service education. The volume makes a compelling case for teacher/school system involvement in planning and implementing in-service education programs.

The University of Bridgeport's performance-based pilot project (described herein) is an excellent example of an in-service education program involving classroom teachers, school administrators and college faculty in the joint planning and implementation of an individualized Master's degree/Standard Certificate program.

Dick Mastain

SP 007 170

MAP -- UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT'S MULTIPLE ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM -- AN ENLIGHTENING EXAMPLE

MAP - What is It? MAP is the University of Bridgeport's Multiple Alternatives Program, a competency-based teacher education model for in-service elementary teachers, with high priority given to three basic aspects of the program.

PROCESS - Teachers, their school representatives, and college faculty share--on a parity basis--all phases of MAP decision-making:

+ Identification of participant's professional needs within the teaching context;
+ Planning a Professional Growth Program tailored to the individual's identified needs;
+ Evaluation of participant's professional competence upon completion of learning activities designed to meet identified needs.

INPUT - Each Professional Growth Plan is designed and planned by the participant and a staff member, and emphasizes the teacher's needs.

PRODUCT - Each participant's professional performance is evaluated on the degree to which specific performance goals, based on identified needs, have been achieved.

Presently, teachers can earn up to 12 semester hours credit through MAP. The majority of the 26 teachers enrolled during 1972-73 are working toward a master's degree in Elementary Education. The State requires a master's, or 30 credits beyond the bachelor's, for the Standard Certificate, plus three years of successful teaching.

Courses required by the University of Bridgeport for the master's degree in Elementary Education leading to the Standard Certificate are:

TOTAL 33 CREDITS

Area A - Foundations of Education, 9 credits--3 each in Philosophy of Education, Educational Psychology, and Research Methods.

Area B - Specialization in Elementary Education, 12 credits. Student must complete 3 credits in each: Seminar in Elementary Education, and Creativity in the Elementary Classroom.

Area C - Electives--12 credits; may be in professional and/or general education, depending upon student's general education background.

The 1972-73 MAP participants can substitute the 12 credits earned through MAP for Area B courses. Beginning next year, the staff hopes to provide credit in all areas through MAP, i.e. the master's degree in Elementary Education.

How Does MAP Work? MAP participants go through 4 phases: Assessment, Planning, Training, and Evaluation. The chart below shows these phases in detail with examples from a participant's actual experience. All plans and decisions, it is emphasized, are made in collaboration with the participant, MAP staff adviser, school system adviser and/or others concerned.

ASSESSMENT PHASE - Description	Example: MAP Participant
1. Analysis of participant's teaching performance for identification of professional needs. This assessment includes: extensive personal interviews, classroom observations, and other data-gathering approaches such as Flander's Verbal Interaction Analysis.	1. Analysis of performance shows teacher has difficulty meeting individual needs of students in reading program--problem classroom areas: use of materials, management techniques, and accommodation to varying learning rates and styles.
2. Analysis of educational priorities and goals of teacher's school involving teachers, school personnel and MAP staff.	2. Instructional priorities of teacher's school include improvement in the reading program and more effective use of resources within the building.

3. Meshing teacher's professional needs with school's institutional priorities and goals. The MAP staff has developed and tested a two-dimensional matrix to facilitate this process.	3. Meshing teacher's professional needs with school's priorities and goals leads to goal statement: "To develop specific instructional strategies for individualized reading."
PLANNING PHASE - Description	**Example: MAP Participant**
The planning phase involves 3 steps: 1. Analysis of professional goal statements generated in the Assessment Phase in terms of: + What skills, knowledge, and behaviors will be necessary to meet these goals?	1. Analysis of goal statement reveals that to attain goal of developing specific instructional strategies for individualized reading, the teacher needs more knowledge about: 1) management techniques; 2) specific diagnostic approaches to reading problems; 3) available curriculum materials in this area.
2. Translation of skills, knowledge, and behaviors into performance objectives. Objectives to be classified in terms of importance and feasibility. Participant's Professional Growth Plan will be based on those objectives ranking highest.	2. One performance objective resulting from teacher's goal analysis is: "Teacher can develop, use, and evaluate effectiveness of individualized Learning Activity Package to help 5th grade level readers master reading for detail."
3. Development of a set of learning activities and assessment procedures based on agreed-upon performance objectives. The end result is a composite of learning experiences (courses, modules, workshops, field visits, etc.) which will be made available to each MAP Participant.	3. Teacher develops learning activities to help achieve performance objective: includes MAP workshops--Diagnosing Difficulties, Selecting and Evaluating Reading Materials for Individualized Instruction, and Creating Learning Activity Packages; visit sites of model reading programs; and clinical sessions with advisers.
TRAINING PHASE - Description	**Example: MAP Participant**
Activities may take the form of: + taking courses; + attending workshops, seminars, clinical sessions arranged by MAP staff; + independent activities--reading, travel, research, and such.	Teacher actually participates in activities described in Planning Phase 3. By end of Training Phase, Teacher will have developed a Learning Activity Package (including pre- and post-test) for children reading at the 5th grade level.
EVALUATION PHASE - Description	**Example: MAP Participant**
Upon completion of a set of learning activities for a specific performance objective, the MAP teacher undergoes the evaluation procedure. If performance is found to be satisfactory, the teacher goes on with activities designed for another objective. If not deemed satisfactory, the teacher is asked to do remedial work; or the performance may be re-evaluated in terms of a revision of the stated objective.	The teacher field-tests the material developed and determines its effectiveness through administration of pre- and post-tests. Evidence of competency includes copies of the Learning Activity Package, test results, observation by MAP adviser, school principal and/or colleagues.

For further information, contact: Dr. Robert Kranyik
Multiple Alternatives Program
Hubbell Hall, University of Bridgeport
Bridgeport, Ct., 06602 (203-387-0711, ext. 769)

PBTE CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN BOSTON -- APRIL 16-17

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is sponsoring a series of regional conferences on Performance-Based Teacher Education this year. The major cost for the conferences are covered by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education--hence the remarkably low registration fee. The conference scheduled for our area will be held in Boston, April 16-17. Among the purposes of the AACTE Conferences are:

+ To explain PBTE and its implications for teacher education, evaluation and certification;
+ To demonstrate actual performance-based teacher education programs.

At the Boston conference, the following will be among the scheduled events:

Activity Sessions:

"Objectives and Assessment" -- Dr. Norman Dodl, Director of the Florida Catalog of Teaching Competencies Project.

"Instructional Programs" -- Dr. Robert Houston, University of Houston (Texas).

"Management of PBTE Programs" -- Dr. Casteel Gentry, University of Toledo (Ohio).

"Certification" -- Theodore Andrews, New York State Department of Education and the Multi-State Consortium on PBTE.

PBTE Model Demonstrations:

University of Pittsburgh
State University College at Buffalo (New York)
State University College at Cortland (New York)

Special Topics:

Panel Discussion -- an "Awareness" session
Slide/Tape Presentation on PBTE
"Rap" Sessions with PBTE program participants
Lecture on PBTE

DETAILS:

TIME: April 16 (Monday) -- registration begins 7:45 a.m., last activity ends 6:00 p.m.
April 17 (Tuesday) 8:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

PLACE: Sheraton Plaza Hotel (Copley Square) -- Boston, Massachusetts.

ADVANCE REGISTRATION: $15.00 fee. For registration forms, contact:

1. Mrs. Carey Curtis
Education Improvement Center
120 Division Street
New Haven, Ct. (203-787-7449)

or

2. Dr. Karl Massanari
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036.

THE CLEARING HOUSE FOR THE CONNECTICUT PILOT PROJECTS ON PBTE

The Clearing House is housed at the Education Improvement Center (120 Division St. New Haven, Ct. 06511) and operates under a grant from the Joint Teacher Education Committee of the State Board of Education and the Commission for Higher Education. While we are not equipped to disseminate many of our materials outside the pilot projects, we would be happy to share our information. Anyone who wishes to peruse the materials in our library and module collection is welcome to make an appointment to come to the Clearing House. Call or write to: Dr. Dick Mastain or Mrs. Carey Curtis (203-787-7449). Finally, in order to make our materials accessible to interested persons outside the pilot projects, we are presently preparing an annotated bibliography of the materials in our library, which should be printed within the next month. For a copy, contact Mrs. Curtis at the above address or telephone number.